



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,155	08/24/2001	David Carroll Challenger	RPS9 2001 0045	6294

7590 09/22/2005

IBM Corporation, Intellectual Property Law
Personal and Printing Systems Group
Dept. 9CCA/Bldg. 002-2
P.O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

TRAN, TONGOC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/940,155

Applicant(s)

CHALLENGER ET AL.

Examiner

Tongoc Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/24/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's application no. 09/940,155.

Claims 1-12 are pending.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the claim recites "encrypting normally inaccessible (AN) data... and storing said NA data...". It is unclear whether said NA data is referring to the encrypted NA data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mirov et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,236, hereinafter Mirov) in view of Ishibashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,820 hereinafter Ishibashi) and Christeson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,522, hereinafter Christeson).

In respect to claim 1, Mirov discloses a method for securing alterable data in a managed system comprising the steps of (col. 1, lines 25-35): storing encryption keys (col. 4, lines 42-55), encrypting normally inaccessible (NA) data with private key (col. 4, lines 1-17, (secure (or encrypted) micro-code), storing said NA data (secure micro-code) and accessible non-encrypted (ANE) (or unsecured micro-code) in an unprotected electronically erasable programmable read only memory with existing write protected algorithm (col. 3, line 55-65). Mirov discloses encrypting with asymmetrical encryption key but not symmetrical encryption key. However, encrypting symmetrical key is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement symmetrical encryption key on Mirov's system for its speed. Mirov discloses the micro-code is stored in an authentication section of a memory but does not explicitly disclose but Ishibashi discloses a secure memory only accessible only by the BIOS code (col. 6, lines 22-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of Ishibashi's secure memory accessible by BIOS only with the teaching of Mirov's storing of encryption key in authentication section for secure protection of the key from being tampered by computer users. Furthermore, Mirov does not explicitly disclose but Christeson discloses remotely altering data (Christeson, col. 2,

lines 16-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Christeson's remotely altering memory with Mirov's teaching of updating micro-code storing in the memory for the benefit of dynamically updating without having to remove any cover or part of the computer (Christeson, col. 2, lines 16-19).

In respect to claim 2, Mirvo, Ishibashi and Christeson disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: altering said ANE data by issuing an existing write request to said BIOS from said write protect algorithms for said EEPROM; and updating said ANE data in said EEPROM (Mirvo, col. 3, lines 55-65).

In respect to claim 3, Mirvo, Ishibashi and Christeson disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: accessing said NA data via a change request issued to said BIOS over a secure communication link; validating said change request; retrieving said symmetrical encryption Key by said BIOS in response to said validated change request; using said symmetrical encryption Key to decrypt and alter said NA data; encrypting said altered NA data using said symmetrical encryption Key; and storing said altered encrypted NA data in said EEPROM (Christeson, Fig. 5 and 6, col. 10, line 54-col. 12, line 67).

In respect to claim 4, Mirvo, Ishibashi and Christeson disclose the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: hashing said ANE data and encrypting said Hash with said symmetrical encryption Key; storing said encrypted Hash with said ANE data; computing a Hash of configuration data in said ANE data on a boot-up request; decrypting said stored encrypted Hash of said configuration data; comparing said

decrypted Hash of said stored configuration data to said computed Hash of said configuration data from said ANE data; booting normally in response to a compare of said decrypted Hash and said computed hash; and issuing tamper notification and initiating recovery processes on a non-compare of said decrypted Hash and said computed hash (Mirvo, col. 2, 21-32 and col. 3, line 55-col. 5, line 50).

I In respect to claims 5-12, the claimed limitations computer program product and system that are substantially similar to method claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 5-12 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Cromer et al. Disclose protecting information on a computer readable medium.

-Cromer et al. Disclose data processing system and method for password protecting a boot device.

-Laczko et al. Disclose a secure computing device having boot read only memory verification of program code.

-Dunham et al. Disclose password protecting rom based utilities in an adapter rom.

-Cromer et al. Disclose a computer system having flash memory bios which can be accessed remotely while protected mode operating system is running.

-Cummins discloses computer software encryption apparatus.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

September 16, 2005


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Application/Control Number: 09/940,155
Art Unit: 2134

Page 7